

ONTARIO YORKSHIRES IN MANITOBA.**Prof. Day replies to "Manitoban's" criticisms.**

Editor "The Farming World" :

In your paper of July 31st, I notice there is a communication signed "Manitoban," which criticises some of the Yorkshire hogs which have of late been sent to Manitoba. Everyone will agree that it is possible to go to extremes; and there is no doubt that it is possible to breed Yorkshires so much of the "greyhound" type that their usefulness will be impaired. At the same time it is possible to go to the other extreme and breed Yorkshires towards the short, thick type which, for the export trade, is also a serious drawback. I may also say that there is no need to add a foot to the nose and ears of the animal in order to get a modern Yorkshire. An inch or two would be nearer the mark. Instead of saying, "What is the use of reducing the diameter of the head a few inches and adding a foot to the head and ears?" I would say, "What is the use of reducing the length of the nose one or two inches and adding ten or fifteen pounds to the weight of the neck and jawl, which have practically no market value?" I do not think that swine-breeders generally, or even packers, claim that the Tamworth is the only bacon hog; and, even in Tamworths, we find breeders who are so anxious to shorten the nose that they are shortening up the hog generally and injuring its usefulness.

In careful experiments here, we have found that it is not the pig which becomes very fat which necessarily makes the most economical gain. We find that a hog that grows rapidly and forms bone and muscle rather than fat is a more economical producer than the short, chubby, fat type which is so much admired by many people. If a hog or any other animal is to make rapid gains it must be a large eater. We cannot get something from nothing, and so long as the hog's constitution has not

been injured by injudicious breeding, the long-sided hog with medium width of back will be found an economical producer (though he may not get extremely fat) if anyone cares to use scales in connection with his foods and his hogs. With the old-fashioned type of Yorkshire we find a short, turned-up nose, a heavy jawl, a thick neck, a tendency to heavy, rough shoulders, and a somewhat short side. Of course, any person who likes this type of hog is at liberty to breed it, but he must not ask the packer or the Old Country consumer to fall in with his fancy. If we do not wish to cater to the English trade, than we may breed Yorkshires, or any other breed of hogs, as pleases our fancy; but, if we are anxious to firmly establish our trade with Great Britain, then we must breed hogs, whether they be Tamworth, Yorkshire or Berkshire, with good length of side, smooth shoulder and comparatively light head; and I think any swine-breeder will admit that as soon as we follow this line of breeding the nose will be found elongated in sympathy with the rest of the stretching process. It is almost impossible to obtain a hog of sufficient length of body for the modern bacon trade and at the same time have it possess a short, stubby nose. It is true that the nose is of no market value, and a few inches more or less make very little difference in the weight of the pig, but a few inches in diameter of the head makes a very considerable difference in the weight of the hog, and also adds very much to the weight of the cheap part of the carcass.

While I am a strong advocate of breeding a lengthy type of hog, at the same time I think it well to offer a word of caution against going to extremes, because there is no doubt that there is a limit to the length of body which a hog may safely carry. If we go beyond this limit weakness of constitution is likely to be the result.

Of course, I have not seen the hogs which "Manitoban" has criticised, and probably there may be sufficient ground for his condemnation, but I think he has made a